

INDIA'S AWAKENING

ITS NATIONAL AND WORLD-WIDE SIGNIFICANCE

BY
WILFRED WELLOCK

LONDON, 1922
THE LABOUR PUBLISHING COMPANY, LTD.
6, TAVISTOCK SQUARE.

PREFACE

THE following pages are a sincere attempt to place before the British public facts concerning the many sided Indian Home Rule Movement of which it is at present in almost total ignorance. It has been the author's aim to let the Movement speak for itself, and to leave the reader to form his own opinion of its value and importance. Two things he would add (1) That the Movement possesses world wide significance and cannot long be ignored by the people of this country (2) That neither violence nor persecution can extinguish it. There is a lull at present. There may be others. But new offensives will be made, the Movement cannot die, for its roots are spiritual.

November 1922

W W

INDIA'S AWAKENING

FEW things in history are comparable to the present situation in India. An awakening is taking place in that vast continent such as mankind witnesses scarcely once in a thousand years. The Gandhi movement is as much an effect as a cause of that awakening, being its symbol, and, with it, the promise of a new civilisation, the emergence of a new humanity. So profound is the change in spirit and outlook that is being effected, and so rapidly is the transformation taking place, that no acquaintance with India dating farther back than the last half-dozen years or so, would appear to be of much use in estimating the value of the present spiritual upheaval. Without doubt India is moved to-day as she has not been moved since the decline of her ancient civilisation. But what is more significant is that the revolt is giving rise to an idealism whose purpose goes much deeper than the freeing of the country from the political and economic control of Britain, that purpose being, indeed, to free India, and perhaps the whole world, from the materialism which threatens East and West alike.

Current events in India seem irresistibly to carry the mind back to Palestine at the time of Christ. In each case we have a defenceless people struggling for freedom against a colossal Empire of matchless dimensions, naval and military power, and wealth. In each case we observe the same tendency to raise the movement for freedom from the particular to the universal, to convert the struggle for national liberation from a particular tyrant nation or Empire into a titanic conflict for world-wide freedom from the growing menace of materialism. In each case, moreover, a leader comes forth who champions the cause of freedom by means of purely spiritual weapons, appeals to the conscience alone, and seeks to create a new national, or rather international, con-

sciousness. Thus Jesus, after preaching for a little while alone, called and sent out the twelve, afterwards the seventy, and thereby roused the mind of the entire community, to the great alarm of the authorities. The spiritual revolution which Christ effected was accomplished in three years. The Non co-operation movement in India is only eighteen months old, yet already the entire nation has been affected by it, not to speak of other nations in the Near and Far East, while its leader is in gaol!

Whether this new movement possesses sustaining power, motive and vision sufficient to achieve the end desired, only time can say. What must be obvious to any dispassionate observer is that it is the expression of something more than a passing impulse and that whether it succeeds or fails in its immediate object, India will never again be the submissive India of pre-war days, or the tool and victim of British financiers.

It is necessary, therefore, that we in this country at least try to understand what is taking place in India.

I have described the new movement as an awakening. It is nothing less. The agitation out of which it has sprung has been proceeding for a considerable time. Periodic outbursts against the tyranny of British rule there have always been but prior to the last two decades or so there has been little or no constructive thought or idealism behind the feeling of revolt. During the last twenty years however, leaders of a quite new type have emerged men of fine character and of considerable constructive ability. According to Gandhi it was after the partition of Bengal that the new spirit came to birth. To quote him:

for liberation from the domination of British rule, and of Western civilisation with its life destroying materialism, have been as startling in their magnitude as in their deep seated character.

Gandhi is the author of the Non co-operation movement. Nevertheless, policies have been advocated during the past fifteen or twenty years by some of the foremost thinkers in India which would ultimately, or so it seems to me, have led to the same result. As early as 1905 Tagore had advocated a line of action which had it succeeded, would have had the effect of starving out the British. His idea was for young Indians to concentrate on the villages and by organising them on a co-operative basis to reconstruct the social and economic life of the country. The political situation would then have been in their hands. Also by so doing he hoped that India would prove her worth, and thereby secure the co-operation of the best elements in the British nation. But in the light of recent European history and British Imperialist policy would India not rather have won the enmity of the worst elements in Britain and been repressed even as to-day? A regenerated India on the lines suggested by Tagore would have implied a regenerated world and to prevent the dawn of such a world nearly all the organised political and financial forces in the earth are to-day conspiring. It is more than likely therefore that had Tagore's idea been acted upon the new movement would have been sabotaged by the Government and would thus have led sooner or later to a policy of Non-co-operation—or, lacking a Gandhi to something worse. A few excerpts from papers written by Tagore between the years 1905-1908 dealing with this policy may not be out of place. The first is in the nature of a complaint.

what others can take away It was only our folly which led us to call such a thing by the name of self government And yet self government lies at our very door waiting for us No one has tried nor is it possible for any one even if he does try to deprive us of it We can do everything we like for our villages—for their education their sanitation the improvement of their communications if only we made up our minds to set to work if only we can act in unison For this work we do not need the sanction of a Government badge

If some one wants to go a voyaging on a petition paper boat in quest of the golden fleece a certain class of patriots may be attracted by thus fairy tale proposition but I would not recommend any one to risk real national capital in the venture

The sinking pulse of the nation has begun to throb with a new life Now that the nation's heart is beating let the nation's brains direct the work of the limbs

We must free our industries control our education strengthen our community and be prepared to strain every nerve in this stupendous endeavour

** For good or ill Tagore's advice was not followed at any rate to any appreciable extent At the same time his demand for independent thought and action has no doubt been a powerful factor in shaping or at least preparing the way for a Non co operation movement A demand for independent action coupled with a growing disbelief in the Government gives ultimately Non co-operation

But not only has Radical thought tended towards a policy of Non co-operation the policy advocated by the Moderates has tended scarcely less in the same direction Indeed so brutal and dishonest has British policy been during recent years that there is cause for thankfulness that India possesses men capable in such critical times of developing such a method as Non-co-operation at all and of resisting red revolution and I think despur

The only other alternative would appear to be descent into perdition It is an indisputable fact that there is no little hope in India that Britain will cede one jot of real power so long as Indians are prepared to acknowledge British authority This fact is bluntly stated by Bernard Houghton ICS (retired) in a pamphlet entitled Reform or Revolution'

" After her loyalty in the War, the Rowlatt Act came to India as a sudden slap in the face. Its meaning is not, however, difficult to understand. The perils of the War had extorted from the bureaucracy the very guarded declaration of August, 1917. They were forced to yield this outward to their opponents. But with the return of peace, when their alarm had subsided, they hastened to set up new bulwarks against democracy. The Rowlatt Act is one such bulwark, the rules under the Reform Act are another"

Gandhi also, in his trial statement, is equally explicit :

". . . The first shock came in the shape of the Rowlatt Act, a law designed to rob the people of any real freedom I felt called upon to lead an intensive agitation against it. Then followed the Punjab horrors, beginning with the massacre at Jallianwala Bag, and culminating in crawling orders, public floggings, and other indescribable humiliations. I discovered, too, that the plighted word of the Prime Minister to the Mussulmans in India regarding the integrity of Turkey and the holy places of Islam was not likely to be fulfilled. But, in spite of the forebodings and the grave warning of friends, at the Amritsar Congress in 1919, I fought for co-operation and working the Montagu-Chelmsford reforms, hoping that the Prime Minister would redeem his promise to the Indian Mussulmans, that the Punjab would be healed, and that the reforms, inadequate and unsatisfactory though they were, marked a new era of hope in the life of India. But all that hope was scattered. The Khilafat promise was not to be redeemed. The Punjab crime was whitewashed, and most culprits went not only unpunished but remained in service, and some continued to draw pensions from the Indian revenue, and in some cases were even rewarded. I saw, too, that not only did the reforms not mark a change of heart, but they were only a method of further draining India of her wealth and of prolonging her servitude."

But these writers, like many others, do not stop here; they go from fact to theory. For example, after giving a record of "Diarchy up-to-date," "the political persecutions, the open support of the liquor trade, the treatment of the Assam labourers, the Dharwar shootings, and the long list of measures vetoed," Houghton asks: "Where is the promised era?" making this comment: "If this be the path to freedom, it leads through a strange country." He then proceeds to defend a revolu-

tionary policy—on the lines, that is, of non-co-operation and non-violence Let me quote him :

"Diarchy is merely bureaucracy painted white"

" Will the officials train for self government ? Will men whose whole training has been autocratic, whose class and race interests are bound up with ascendancy, whose traditions are all of despotic rule—will such as these cast aside every thing, training, interests, and traditions, and become apostles of liberty ? As well expect Lord Curzon to preach Socialism or Sir George Younger to co-operate with Pussy-foot Johnson "

" The Moderates . . represent a type of thought that is found in all countries and in every epoch Whenever a decisive break is to be made with the past, a bold step forward to be taken and risks to be faced there will always be men who counsel moderation They play for safety for themselves certainly, for their country, as they believe But they are always ready to occupy the ground won by the braver spirits " " But has a bureaucracy ever given up power willingly ? Have not officials always clutched to the end at the garment of authority, nor yielded it until torn from their grasp ? Such a Government may utter fair words . . but when it comes to the actual handing over of power—ah ! then it will find a hundred excuses, a hundred reasons, for delay Never, except under duress, will it give up power—real power In brief, it gives when it must , it holds when it can ' Moreover "reforms . fail to bring into play any great motive force *They do not quicken, they do not inspire*" Whereas " Revolution, in the sense defined, offers a bolder strategy It strikes, not at some outwork but straight at the citadel of the enemy On its flag is blazoned a great ideal, something for which men will meet suffering with a smile, and look undaunted in the eyes of death It sounds a trumpet which rouses the toiler from his toil, thrills his heart and illuminates all his mind with the glory of a new born land "

And again .

" Revolution tears the souls of many from their old moorings, and sets them voyaging, each a new Columbus, in search of new worlds . India is capable of a Renaissance, . . a re birth This is the crown and glory of the great peaceful revolution to which Mahatma Gandhi now leads the people of India "

It is interesting to observe the change that has taken place in the mind of Lajpat Rai, on this question A great Indian patriot, for many years an exile, Lajpat Rai has stood for co-operation with Britain to the very

last. He is now firmly on the side of Gandhi. The following passages are taken from his recent book, "The Call to Young India":

"They" (the Moderates) "have read Morley's book on compromise and they quote it in season and out of season. Their political thought is old-fashioned and sterile. Everything is bound to become sterile which is hedged round by considerations of excessive prudence and expediency, so as to bury the element of truth and nobility in it deep down under the *débris* of policy . . . Nothing is so inspiring, so magnetic, so forceful, in changing public opinion, and in transforming national character, as readiness to suffer for truth. . . . The moral effect of one such life on the development of a nation is equal, or perhaps exceeds, that of one hundred well-balanced, sober, prudent, calculating, compromising Moderates."

"The Morleys and the Bryces only differ in degree from the Curzons and the Milners. Do not pin your faith in any of them. At heart the Liberals and the Conservatives are the same. The Liberals have killed Liberalism by their hypocritical, time serving Imperialism and Capitalism. . . . Young India should stand by their Keir Hardies, Lansburys and Smillies."

"The only classes in Great Britain to whom it is of any use appealing for international justice are the Socialists and the Labourites. The Liberal Party contains some very fine souls, but the bulk of them are rank Imperialists and their imperialism is, in my judgment, more harmful to the world of dependencies than that of the Tories. The Liberals talk a great deal of *justice*, and *democracy* and *liberty*, but when the time for action comes, they act even worse than the Tories."

"I have always been of the opinion that the presence of Indian members on the Legislative Councils has done more harm to the country than good. Mr Gokhale co-operated in passing the Press Act. Pandit Malaviya co-operated in passing the Defence of India Act. The Nationalist members co-operated in sanctioning the gift of £100,000,000 towards the expenses of the Great War . . . So far the Indian members have failed to influence the legislatures of the country in the fundamentals of government policy."

"I was fully prepared for co-operation . . . until I began to feel that both the Government of India and the Secretary of State were engrossed in undoing what had been done . . . The bureaucracy relies on honours and supports those who . . . stood by them during the last disturbances, never mind how corrupt and immoral they may be . . ."

"The bureaucracy is determined to defeat the Reform,

and the Secretary of State has placed them in a position to do so successfully. In my judgment it is absolute folly to make ourselves even partially responsible for this inevitable failure."

"My attitude towards the reform scheme was one of partial relation in 1918, . . . of depression in 1919, . . . of despair in 1920."

Gandhi is clear and emphatic. In an article entitled "The Death Dance," published in the last issue of *Young India* (which he edited), before his arrest, he wrote:

"It is the same thing whether it is done with the kid glove on or without it. The councils are the kid glove. We must pay for the glove. The reforms hang upon us like an incubus. They cover a multitude of defects, including the blood sucking salt tax. It would be n thousand times better for us to be ruled by a military dictator than to have the dictatorship concealed under sham councils and assemblies. They prolong the agony and increase the expenditure. If we are so anxious to live, it would be more honourable to face the truth and submit to unabashed dictation, than to pretend that we are slowly becoming free. There is no such thing as slow freedom. Freedom is like a birth. Till we are fully free we are slaves. All birth takes place in a moment. The councillors want their fares and extras, the ministers their salaries, the lawyers their fees, the suitors their decrees, the parents such education for their boys as would give them status in the present life, the millionaires want facilities for multiplying their millions, and the rest their unmanly peace. The whole revolves beautifully round the central corporation. It is a giddy dance from which no one cares to free himself, and so, as the speed increases, the exhilaration is the greater."

These statements reveal the outlook which dominates the mind of India to day. One by one the Moderates, as was the case with Gandhi himself some eighteen months ago, have been compelled, in face of the facts, to join the Extremists, who are now almost solidly in favour of a policy of Non-co-operation. The National Congress, in fact, has identified itself with the Non co-operation policy. Never was a country so moved or so solid for a particular end as is India to day, in its endeavour to free itself from British domination. And after the events of the last five years, and the history of the last seventy, our Government expects to break down that solidarity, to pacify and subdue India, by imprison-

ing a few leaders! Why, as long ago as 1908, Tagore exposed the futility of such a policy—and what a marked development in Indian opinion and unity has taken place since then! Listen to his words

"I repeat that there is no *party* of Extremists with whom the Government has to deal. It is a symptom of the Nationalist movement, which cannot be cured as long as the exciting causes continue to operate, and if suppressed in one form will break out in another, or, at most be driven to bide its time in the innermost recesses of the nation's heart. Our rulers seem to be labouring under the idea that this explosive extremism is being concocted in some secret laboratory by a vicious gang of malcontents and that once the real leader can be hauled before a magistrate the danger will be over."

GANDHI

The cause of Indian emancipation having, for all practical purposes, become identified with Gandhi's Non co-operation movement, it becomes imperative to understand what Gandhi's ideas really are and also, I think, to know something of the life in which those ideas have taken root. For not only is Gandhi the leader of this great movement, he is its soul, embodying in his life the spirit and the principles which he is calling upon his countrymen to accept. And at least we must all be agreed on this, that no ordinary person could have done what Gandhi did in Africa some years ago and what he has since done in India. Inside eighteen months he has not only fastened upon a vast continent an idea, but impregnated it with a spirit, raised its moral and spiritual altitude to a level whence it is endeavouring to fight for freedom by non-violence, or purely spiritual means. Without the slightest doubt this is one of the greatest achievements in the history of man. No wonder the people of India—rich no less than poor, the cultured no less than the illiterate—unite in calling Gandhi Mahatma (Saint).

In an introduction to a booklet by Gandhi, "Ethical Religion," the Rev. J. H. Holmes, of New York, has briefly stated the salient facts concerning Gandhi's life prior to his public career, and I do not think I can do better than repeat them.

Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi was born some fifty odd years ago in India, of a rich, clever and cultivated

family. He was reared as the sons of such families are always reared. In 1889 he came to England to study law. He took his degree in regular course returned to India, and became a successful lawyer in Bombay. Already, however, he had found that religion was coming to have a dominant place in his life. Even before his journey to England he had taken the Jain vow to abstain from wine, flesh, and sexual intercourse. On his return to India his asceticism increased. Finding that money was inconsistent with his ideal of spirituality he gave away his fortune to good causes, keeping only the barest pittance for himself. Later on he took the vow of poverty, and thus became, what he is still to day, a beggar. Later still he became converted to the doctrine of non-resistance, which he calls 'the root of Hinduism,' and therefore abandoned the practice of the law as a system which tried to do right by violence."

In addition, it might be added that, according to Indian custom, Gandhi was married while very young, and before coming to England was the father of a family.

When Gilbert Murray saw him in England, in 1914, he ate only rice, drank only water and slept on the bare boards of a wooden floor. "His conversation" says Professor Murray, "was that of a cultivated and well-read man with a certain indefinable suggestion of saintliness."

As Mr Holmes further comments:

"Gandhi was indeed become a saint. He had deliberately swept out of his life every last vestige of self indulgence, that no slightest desire of the flesh might stand in the way of devotion to his ideals. From early in his life he was a man apart, with every last energy of soul and body dedicated to the service of mankind."

Gandhi's entrance into public life is not easy to explain. It was made, as he himself tells us in his trial statement, in 1893.

"My public life began in 1893 in South Africa in troubled water. My first contact with British authority in that country was not of a happy character. I discovered that as a man and an Indian, I had no rights. More directly, I discovered that I had no rights as a man because I was an Indian."

In 1893 the suppressed Indians of South Africa, suffering under the disabilities of the Asiatic Exclusion Act, called Gandhi to their assistance. But the question

at once springs to the mind Why Gandhi? For in 1893 Gandhi was a young fellow fresh from college with no public experience whatever. The answer is that Gandhi was deliberately chosen because he was an idealist a religious devotee an ascetic, and events proved that the choice was a right one that Gandhi achieved what no mere politician could ever have achieved. For a period of twenty years with but one short break Gandhi laboured unceasingly and accomplished his purpose his heroic achievements little known outside Africa and India ranking among the epic deeds of history. His great feat consisted of drawing the whole of the Hindu population of South Africa to a selected piece of territory and holding them there making them self supporting for a period of years. It was a sort of glorified strike being comparable as Mr Holmes above referred to points out to the strike which Moses declared in ancient Egypt when he led the Israelites out of the land of Pharaoh into the vast reaches of the wilderness. Gandhi's sufferings during this trying period are described by Mr Holmes as follows:

He was thrown into prison countless times placed in solitary confinement lashed hand and foot to the bars of his cage. He was again and again set upon by raging mobs beaten into insensibility and left for dead by the side of the road. When not outraged in this fashion he was insulted in public mortified and humiliated with the most exquisite pains. But nothing shook his courage disturbed his equanimity exhausted his patience or poisoned his love and for giveness of his foes. And at last after twenty years of trial and suffering he won the victory. In 1913 the Indian case was taken up by Lord Hardinge and an Imperial Commission reported in Gandhi's favour on nearly all the points at issue and an Act was passed giving official recognition to his claims.

During this twenty years struggle Gandhi's ideas crystallised as might have been expected in a remarkable manner. Before very long we find him enunciating the principles of non resistance or as it afterwards came to be known non violence. And considering the unique policy which Gandhi adopted to secure freedom in Africa that of a complete withdrawal of labour from all industry (probably suggested by the

life as an Indian is finished Then India will cease to be the pride of my heart

It may prove of interest to compare these early pronouncements with quite recent ones. I will give three quotations from the last issue of *Young India* which Gandhi edited prior to his arrest. They are all more or less concerned with the treatment of the English and accordingly they contain some rather interesting passages.

Let no one blame the unbending English nature. The hardest fibre must melt in the fire of love. I cannot be dislodged from the position because I know it. When British or other nature does not respond the fire is not strong enough.

And if we intend to follow out the policy if we believe in it we must then quickly make up with the Englishmen and the co operators. We must get their certificate that they feel absolutely safe in our midst and that they may regard us as friends although we belong to a radically different school of thought and politics. We must welcome them to our political platforms as honoured guests. We must meet them on neutral platforms as comrades. We must devise methods of such meetings. Our non violence must not breed violence hatred and ill will.

Non co operation is a process of conversion and we have to convert by our moral conduct even Britishers like Sir Robert Watson Smythe. Whilst I am prepared to admit that the President of the Bengal Chamber of Commerce represents the mentality of the majority of English men there is a very respectable minority that certainly does not share the Smythian mentality. And so long as we have an Andrews a Stokes a Pearson in our midst so long will it be ungentlemanly on our part to wish every English man out of India.

It is customary in this country to belittle the Gandhi movement in so far as it rests on non violence. Sooner or later, it is assumed violence must be resorted to. Possibly it will and maybe the Government will do all it can to stimulate recourse to violence. I suppose similar things were once said in Rome about the Christian movement. We must however admit the profound influence which Gandhi's non violence teaching has had upon the entire movement for liberation in India. Nothing that has ever been can compare with it. The National Congress has adopted the idea wholeheartedly,

It is soul force along with economic force that will win in the end

The better mind of the country is opposed to the use of any kind of violence whether of language or of deed in bringing the struggle to a satisfactory close. We are doing our level best sincerely and honestly to achieve our end by peaceful means and with the sincerest desire to keep our connection with the ruling race on a basis of mutual friendship and reciprocal interest.

I want you my countrymen to work in the open with absolute frankness discarding all secret methods and all methods of violence. If you don't win by soul force if you don't win by the force of will and determination of 350 000 000 of human beings, we don't deserve to win by violence. Why think of your power? Think of your potentiality. Think of the force in your heart.

One thing however is not quite clear. Notwithstanding the absolute character of his faith in the principles of non violence Gandhi on four different occasions rendered special assistance to Britain in periods of war or revolt. He mentions each case in his trial statement. I think his words are worth quoting.

I gave the Government my voluntary and hearty co-operation criticising it freely where I felt it was faulty but never wishing its destruction. Consequently when the existence of the Empire was threatened in 1899 by the Boer challenge I offered my services to it raised a volunteer ambulance corps and served at several actions that took place for the Relief of Ladysmith. Similarly in 1906 at the time of the Zulu revolt I raised a stretcher bearer party and served till the end of the rebellion. On both these occasions I received medals and was even mentioned in despatches. For my work in South Africa I was given by Lord Hardinge a Kaiser-i-Hind Gold Medal. When the War broke out in 1914 between England and Germany I raised a volunteer ambulance corps in London consisting of the then resident Indians in London chiefly students. Its work was acknowledged by the authorities to be valuable. Lastly in India when a special appeal was made at the War Conference in Delhi in 1918 by Lord Chelmsford for recruits I struggled at the cost of my health to raise a corps in Kheda and the response was being made when these hostil ties ceased and orders were received that no more recruits were wanted. In all these efforts at service I was actuated by the belief that it was possible by such "vices" to gain a status of full equality in the Empire for my countrymen.

Gandhi's chief motive in these activities seems to have been a desire to "play fair." As soon as the disturbances arose in South Africa he "called off" his "strike," refusing to take advantage of an embarrassed Government to secure his ends to give it a stab in the back, so to speak. Similarly, on the outbreak of the Great War, Gandhi suspended all operations against British rule, objecting to take a mean advantage of the Government, and desiring to win fairly and outright the liberty they sought. Moreover, while Gandhi personally, and also as an Eastern and a Hindu, did not believe in violence, he probably felt that the warring, commercial nations of the West had developed a psychology which rendered war inevitable, if not necessary, *for them*. A passage in ' Indian Home Rule' almost leads one to conclude that such was the case. "Violence," he there says, "whatever end it may serve in Europe, will never serve us in India." Thus in raising his ambulance corps, it was always as an "outsider" that he did so, as if he would say "This method of yours seems to me both foolish and wrong but since you choose it and ask for my assistance I don't mind helping you as a friend, providing you do not ask me to do things to which I have on moral and religious grounds a decided objection." Perhaps too, Gandhi was influenced by that strong desire of his amounting almost to a passion, always to show friendliness towards his adversaries. Certain it is that he regarded the recent War as a "British" and not in any sense an "Indian" war, and he devoutly believed that in helping Britain, as a friend, India would afterwards be rewarded as he says, with the

case of violence on the part of Gandhi and his followers is recorded. Gandhi set about his great task in India with zest. But the War came, and at once the attack upon the Government, or, at any rate, upon British rule, ceased. Immediately after the War, however, the struggle was renewed with increased vigour. The freedom that had been promised was promptly demanded. Delay meant irritation and suspicion. But instead of freedom came increased repression. The people, however, and particularly the leaders, were in no mood to be trifled with. The temper of the nation was reflected in the National Congresses, each of which was more outspoken, more insistent and comprehensive in its demands, and had the backing of a much vaster public, than its predecessor. Then, at last, came Gandhi's bombshell, Non co-operation, which created for the Government a new and unexpected situation, and unified India as it had not been unified since the decline of its ancient civilisation, kindling an enthusiasm that could at last be called national.

What was the cause of this sudden change? The condition created by the War and subsequent British policy made a big Nationalist movement possible, but of themselves, these factors, important as they were, could not have created such a movement as has arisen. For answer we must refer to the policy and personality of Gandhi. Hitherto the cause of liberation had rested mainly on mere words. Gandhi founded it upon action. The first act in the new policy had been taken by Gandhi himself, years ago, in the renunciation of his wealth, as there is no surer foundation for a great cause than self-sacrifice. By his own life Gandhi had captured the imagination of his countrymen, won their respect, and compelled them to listen to him, no matter what he should say. But not only did he act himself, he formulated a policy whereby his countrymen if they really desired freedom, must needs act too. In this Gandhi showed himself to be not only a consummate master of the psychological factors connected with mass movements, but conversant with the nature, cause and course of progress. Also, by carrying out a policy whose advocacy was "sedition" to proclaim that policy was a veritable deed, an act of heroism. Thus, instead of calling endless

meetings of the usual declamatory type, the people were asked to assemble in order to make a bonfire of Manchester cloth. Instead of denouncing Government schools the people were asked to establish native schools. And instead of complaining of the growth of factory labour, and the consequent decay of village life, the people, rich and poor alike, were asked to bring the spinning wheel and the hand loom back into their homes, and thereby, in a very positive way, to check the ravages of the capitalist exploiters. Moreover, instead of complaining against the English for not freely mingling or uniting with Indians Indians were told that they must themselves first put their own house in order by removing the ban from the large class of "untouchables" in their midst, and also by taking definite steps to establish real friendliness and unity between Hindu and Mussulman. Such is the policy which Gandhi and his co-workers have been advocating to the Indian nation during the past year and a half. It is the old boycott policy glorified formulated into a principle of national liberation. Who but a spiritual giant dare have advocated such a programme to a nation of three hundred million souls? Need one wonder that everywhere Gandhi is called "Mahatma," or that educated men should speak of Gandhi, as does Bernard Houghton

to and fro over India hangs the smoke of battle every where we hear the slogan of the attacking hosts Victory is certain

And in a quieter vein C F Andrews in his charming little book *To the Students* writes as follows

I cannot tell you therefore with what joy I have welcomed the new National movement on its constructive side when it came boldly up to these colleges in bondage and said to them Be free I am not a politician and I have never taken active part in any National Congress but as an ardent educationist I can wish God speed with all my heart to this new constructive enthusiasm which is already raising up new schools and colleges making them self dependent self governing and entirely free from all Government control

But one could quote passages in praise and veneration of Gandhi *ad infinitum* I must content myself with the following from Lajpat Rai

The man however who is after our own heart though we do not always agree with him in politics is Gandhi

Where in the world still we find another man equal in spirit self sacrifice and righteousness to Mahatma Gandhi?

I challenge the whole world to produce another man like Mahatma Gandhi Who has produced him? Twenty century India He is not alone I can name several others whose equals you will not find in any other land

statements, the late H M Hyndman, in "The Truth about India," makes the following caustic remarks :

" That the horrors of peace may in many ways be worse than the horrors of war is a consideration which never enters their minds, still less affects their judgment. All the tests of prosperity which they are accustomed to apply are fulfilled. Population is increasing rapidly, poverty is favourable to generation. Exports are rapidly increasing, what is the amount of return? Railways have been built over a large portion of the country, transport does not necessarily increase wealth. Vast irrigation works have been built, old irrigation tanks have been allowed to decay throughout huge areas and the charges for the new water are heavy, rendered still heavier by the enforced use of Government water to the exclusion and shutting down of Indian wells . . ."

And again :

" It is preposterous to argue that irrigation is remedying this state of things. Nothing of the sort. Irrigation applies to a very small area as carried out under European engineers. Sometimes the quality of the water supplied has proved actually injurious owing to miscalculation as to the nature of the silt it would carry with it . . ."

As I have already pointed out, Gandhi remarked during his recent trial that "the reforms were only a method of further draining India of her wealth and of prolonging her servitude" Hyndman justifies this statement in the following remarks :

" From the first began that steady withdrawal of wealth from India to England, which, in one form or another, has gone on ever since. Even the lowest commercial morality cannot justify the robbery and rascality which pervaded every department of English administration in India from the time of Clive's rise to power until the first Governor Generalship of Lord Cornwallis. The praises of the many successful freebooters have been chanted for 150 years with national pride and exultation, the effect of their depredations upon the luckless Indians who suffered from their extortions though denounced at the time by Englishmen of the highest character and reputation, has since been overlooked and is now almost forgotten "

And again :

" It was the economic pressure which perhaps first roused the more intelligent Indians to a full comprehension of the permanent injury which persistent Europeanisation was

inflicting upon India as a whole. And this was first appreciated and forcibly expounded not by Indians but by English merchants and administrators in the days of the East India Company—e.g. Mr Montgomery Martin Mr James Geddes Mr A O Hume Major Evans Bell Colonel Osborne Mr William Digby Mr Knight. But the influence of the hide bound Indian bureaucracy and the personal interests of the middle class at home were too strong to be resisted. On the return of Mr Gladstone's Liberal administration to power all the preliminary reforms were swept away and from that time to this Europeanisation has become more and more the panacea for all evils.

What Europeanisation actually means in hard cash Mr Hyndman carefully explains. After going carefully into all the figures which I am not able to give here he concludes that

Putting aside the profits on tea planting gold mining and other enterprises established and financed by European capitalists the total amount of payments made in produce from India to England without any commercial return is not less than £30 000 000 every year.

He further states that

The agricultural population of India is the most poverty stricken mass of human beings in the whole world. It constitutes four fifths of all the inhabitants of Hindustan. Moreover Lord Curzon estimated the average income of the Indians at not more than £ a year. Mr William Digby put the average value of the production of the cultivators at not more than 1s 6d a year per head.

The process of draining India will be better understood with the addition of the following comparative figures also from Hyndman's *The Truth about*

crops Whenever a famine comes they are stricken with starvation and die by the thousand Sir William Hunter said that forty million Indians go through life with insufficient food Sir Charles Elliott estimated that one half of the agricultural population never satisfied hunger fully from one year's end to another

And further

The fact that we have made mistakes has gradually dawned upon us for when for instance 80 per cent of the cultivators in the United Provinces have mortgages hanging about their necks the situation has become serious

We have destroyed the old social and economic organisation of India we cannot restore it now in its unity and harmony and we have not begun to succeed in putting anything in its place

As to the state of affairs in the large industrial centres wages are exceedingly low while hours are long B P Wadia the founder of trade unionism in India says in his book Labour in Madras

The actual conditions under which the labourers live are indescribable In the city of Bombay 744 000 working men are tenanted in one roomed houses and the room is generally 8 feet by 10 feet and a death rate of 60 per 1 000 is known to prevail

We are not astonished to learn therefore that in Mr Wadia's opinion

The Labour movement is an integral part of the Nationalist movement

Indeed Mr Wadia said to the workers of Madras on one occasion

Home Rule is the big problem your labour troubles are included in it are a part of that great problem

I will conclude this section with a description by Hyndman of the merciless way in which the hand loom weavers of India were treated by British capitalists

In the seventeenth and during a great part of the eighteenth century the importation of Indian calicoes into England was prohibited on the ground that their competition would have crushed the rising home industry in similar goods At the end of the same century however owing to the accumulation of riches chiefly from Hindustan England had become possessed of a virtual monopoly of new machinery run by steam power which enabled her to under

sell the whole world in textile goods of every description English hand loom weavers and spinners suffered seriously

but their miseries were child's play in comparison with the horrors inflicted upon the weavers of India at the same time. No protective tariff was allowed to safeguard them

These poor producers of Indian fabrics saw their means of livelihood swept away from them by a process which they could neither understand nor withstand. Tens upon tens of thousands of them perished of starvation, for there was no place for them in the English society of that day, apart from the one which they occupied. The foreign Government made not the slightest attempt to regulate this fatal Free Trade competition.

(2) Spiritual Notwithstanding the importance of the economic factor as a motive of revolt against British rule, I doubt if it is nearly so powerful as the spiritual factor, the repression of individuality, of mind and spirit, which results from the domination of a so-called superior people and race over an "inferior." It is not easy for a people accustomed to dominate to understand this particular form of oppression. But to free spirits it is a thousand times worse to bear than poverty. Whether we are conscious of it or not, we are thrusting upon India a civilisation which is alien to her, and which most of her more enlightened sons regard as inferior to Eastern civilisation—governed, of course, by a new and developing idealism, an industrial system which they almost all abhor, but which, hitherto, they have felt powerless to resist, a system of education which, by inculcating a belief in the spiritual superiority of the white over the coloured races, is demoralising those upon whom it is being thrust. It is the revolt of the idealists in India against these and similar forms of spiritual oppression that chiefly counts in the National Congress and in the Non-co operation movement, and that will be the primary factor in bringing British rule to an end in that country. Let me give some evidence of the recognition of and the revolt against these modes of enslavement.

In "The Psychology of Empire," Bernard Houghton writes

"The master nations, realising how much depends on prestige, have always taken care, in such schools as they have allowed and in every other way, to impress on the conquered the idea that they are by nature inferior. Such

doctrines coming from the Governments and from those in authority have had great influence and not for good. The suggestion that you are inferior is an evil one. It depresses devitalises. Who would not feel insulted to be held as base in his own country? The desire to win freedom from this reproach is the mainspring of the Non co-operation movement in India. it is why the Egyptians have resolved to be free. The nation comes to regard its subjects as fortunate to have come under its sway—indeed a Lieut tenant Governor of Burmah actually congratulated the Burmese on having been conquered by England. How ever glittering the material show of Empire does it not seem certain that its moral results are evil? Evil it is for the subject peoples in that it humiliates them crushes their national life suggests to them that they are by nature inferior. Evil too it is for the master nation in which it breeds arrogance hatred of neighbours the creed that might is right and militarism and all that militarism means.

In his book To the Students C F Andrews describes the oppression that it was to him as an educator to teach as he was expected to teach in Government aided schools. Finally he had to break away from such schools altogether whereupon he joined a free native school a normal day at which he so beautifully describes in his little book. The decision to sever his connection with Government aided schools is described in a passage which I will quote

At last after many struggles in my own mind and many breakings of ties of old friendships and associations I determined to be free. I felt that true education could only proceed in an atmosphere of pure and joyous freedom which would give creative energy to the mind and spirit. I came to Bolpur and I have been at Shantiniketan for nearly seven years unrestricted by any Government restraints and unhampered by Government doles and grants

Commenting on C F Andrews case J R Macdonald says

Even in educational work co operation is grudgingly recognised. St Andrew's College in Delhi has an Indian Principal and a European staff working under him but the most worthy of that staff the Rev C F Andrews Fellow of Pembroke College Cambridge was struck off a list of nominees for Fellowships of the Punjab University by the Lieut Governor's hand and a man of no educational

attainments put in his place for no other reason than that Mr Andrews has the confidence of Indians The list of these personal affronts is exceedingly long (The Awakening of India)

Four pages further on he says

The Indian cannot become English and in these latter days is beginning to decline to try to become English and our representatives quietly wait for the impossible as a preliminary to their fulfilling what is obviously the first duty of a governing authority such is ours viz to get into intimate contact with the subject people If we cannot tolerate Indian ways in drawing rooms and railway trains obviously we can do no permanent good in India and should leave the place altogether

It will be remembered of course that one of the planks in Gandhis constructive programme is the founding of native schools Thus S E Stokes an American Quaker who has been in India for many years and who has learned to appreciate the spiritual beauty of much that is in Indian civilisation boldly declares

The object upon which we must set our hopes and towards which we must at present strive is the freeing of the peoples of this land from the debasing position of political inferiority in which they at present find themselves

chiefly that they may be enabled to realise the potentialities of their natures as free moral agents We are convinced that no people living in subserviency to another people which looks down upon it and considers it racially inferior can be otherwise than debased Our immediate object therefore is the destruction of all those aspects of life in India to by which imply or make possible the assumption of the superiority of the white man as such (National Self Realisation)

trialism i.e. mass production controlled by capitalists grows appreciably Not only is that industrialism impoverishing India it is demoralising her and destroying her beautiful arts and handicrafts into the bargain As says Hyndman

It is not poverty alone that occasions this sad state of things Everything tends in the same direction Native Indian arts are disappearing education is neglected there is no life or pleasure available no outlet for energy no hope for change no variety of occupation

Tagore puts it more strongly thus

As the European mills are killing our handicrafts so is the all pervading machinery of an alien Government destroying our simple old village organisations Nowhere do we see any signs of the former activities The water stores are drying the pastures are no longer kept inviolate temples are falling into decay and the unlettered sons of the village pundits who used to be the cement of the community are earning a precarious livelihood by giving false evidence

Gandhi speaks in even stronger terms still The spiritually disastrous effects of factory industry under capitalist control have so impressed him as to have turned him against the use of machinery altogether In this regard however it is only fair to say that he has only a limited following To understand his point of view on this matter it is necessary to read him somewhat extensively I will quote as much as I can possibly find space for

But one effort is required and that is to drive out Western civilisation All else will follow European (civilisation) is a nine days wonder Such ephemeral civilisations have often come and gone and will continue to do so It is machinery that has impoverished India It is difficult to measure the harm that Manchester has done to us It is due to Manchester that Indian hand craft has all but disappeared

But I make a mis take How can Manchester be blamed We were Manchester cloth and that is why Manchester wove it

Machinery has begun to desolate Europe Ruination is now knocking at the English gates Machinery is the chief symbol of modern civilisation it represents a great in

The workers in the mills of Bombay have become slaves

The condition of the women working in the mills is shocking. When there were no mills these women were not starving. If the machinery craze grows in our country it will become an unhappy land. It may be considered a heresy but I am bound to say it were better for us to send money to Manchester, and to use flimsy Manchester cloth than to multiply mills in India. By using Manchester cloth we would only be wasting our money but by reproducing Manchester in India we shall keep our money at the price of our blood because our very moral being will be sinned and I call in support of my statement the very mill hands as witnesses. And those who have amassed wealth out of factories are not likely to be better than other rich men. It would be folly to assume that an Indian Rock-feller would be better than an American Rockefeller. Impoverished India can become free but it will be hard for an India made rich through immorality to regain its freedom. I fear we will have to admit that moneyed men support British rule.

Money renders a man helpless. We need not therefore, be pleased with the prospect of the growth of the mill industry.

He further says that it is because India was morally weak that it permitted Western civilisation to enter its borders at all. Thus

"Because the sons of India were found wanting its civilisation has been placed in jeopardy. But its strength is seen in its ability to survive the shock. Those alone who have been affected by Western civilisation have become enslaved. If we become free India is free. And in this thought you have a definition of Swaraj. It is when we learn to rule ourselves. It is therefore in the palm of our hands."

Now you will see that it is not necessary for us to have as our goal the expulsion of the English. If the English become Indianised we can accommodate them. If they wish to remain in India along with their civilisation there is no room for them. It lies with us to bring about such a state of things. If we keep our own house in order, only those who are fit to live in it will remain. Others will leave of their own accord. We brought the English and we keep them. Why do you forget that our adoption of their civilisation makes their presence in India at all possible? Your hatred against them ought to be transferred to their civilisation.

under British rule, they ask us ? It is a pity that the obvious answer does not strike them—because it is British and not ours. What we want is our manhood—the right to live our lives, the opportunity to manage our affairs, in short, to be ourselves.

"It is a tragedy of modern life, with its high claims to civilisation, culture and humanity, that such a people should be bullied by a purely materialistic imperialism kept down by the most barbarous of militarisms and exploited by a refined industrialism of the most grasping kind. With three fourths of humanity under the heel of militaristic imperialism, starved to death both physically and intellectually by a handful of the rest, always cursing and bating their masters, how can there be peace on earth?"

Imperialism knows no logic. It does not deal in humanities. It is single minded or using President Wilson's phrase 'it is a one tracked mind'. That mind thinks only in terms of Empire, of territories of subject peoples of markets and of wealth and glory. Everything else is secondary.

(3) Racial. It is to be feared that not many in this country realise the importance or urgency of the race issue as it exists for India at the present moment. We do not realise, that is to say, that the "white" portion of the British Empire is almost unanimously opposed to opening its borders to Asiatics. India, e.g., whose wealth and man power have played a considerable part in the building up of this Empire, is forbidden access to four-fifths of that same Empire outside India. In Australia, in New Zealand, in Canada, in South Africa, the Indian is regarded as "inferior" by the white population, and is either refused admission to those countries or accepted under humiliating conditions. And the East, far more than the West, needs room for expansion. Thus the race problem, which most Englishmen regard with hazy indifference, is to India a problem of great urgency, and as important on its spiritual as on its economic side. S. E. Stokes, in his "National Self-Realisation," makes this warning:

"At the time of the American Civil War Abraham Lincoln declared 'This nation cannot exist half slave half free.' That declaration is also true of this Empire. Politically and socially, its various parts must be equal if it is to survive. Either get the Colonies to throw open their doors to their Indian fellow subjects, giving them exactly

to Mesopotamia and other lands, in order to hold down by force Asiatic peoples struggling to be free. We have thus however unwilling, been used as a tool to bring still further into subjection, under the white races the peoples of Asia. And now, we are to be called upon, at the bidding of Australia and other Colonies, to fight once more for 'white' race supremacy. India is to be compelled for the sake of the solidarity of the Empire to uphold a 'White Australia' policy against Japan and, indeed, against herself! The thing is unthinkable!"

In the book by Stokes, just referred to, there are a number of quotations showing how widespread is the idea of "white race supremacy" within the British Empire, as also in America. As the subject is of such profound importance, I propose giving a number of extracts. Stokes's contention is that the failure of European culture or civilisation to unify the whole of mankind is its completest condemnation and the surest guarantee that it cannot stand.

Concerning the author, Mr Andrews writes as follows in his introduction:

'During the War Mr Stokes did everything in his power to help the British Empire to victory. He naturalised himself as a British citizen and became an officer in the army. He won distinction by his zeal for recruiting. He firmly believed in the righteousness of the Allied cause. But the Peace Treaties have brought with them disillusionment and to-day he regards the menace of the white race supremacy as the most sinister portent in the present history of mankind.'

At the close of his introduction, Andrews gives one or two references which I think claim earnest consideration. One is from Mr Keith Murdoch's message to England, given on the anniversary of the Australian Foundation Day, the other is *The Times* (London) reply to the same. I will reproduce them both.

"We come to the frank question whether Britain is as much prepared to maintain Australia's interests in the Pacific as Australia proved herself prepared to defend Britain's in Europe? The object of a policy of a 'White Australia' is not mere economic selfishness, but the sacred cause of racial purity. Therefore Australia demands that the *status quo* in the Pacific should be guaranteed if need be by British guns. Will Britain if need be build great ships? Will she fight for 'White Australia'? The

Australians believe that the answer will be 'Yes'. But this question will be raised at the Imperial Conference in June, perhaps not by Australia only. Now that the Dominions are acknowledged as free nations within the Empire, *it may well be that a written pact will be asked for*"

The Times editor replied as follows

'To our thinking there can be no doubt about the answer. If there be any doubt then we may say farewell not only to Australia, but to the other Dominions, for New Zealand South Africa Canada all hold the same belief with almost equal determination. To some people in this country the race question—as between white and non white—is either a joke or a symbol of a crude lack of culture. They refuse to take it seriously, or they grow hot with indignation at the exclusion of non white peoples from British countries. This way leads to worse friction with the Dominions than has occurred for half a century. Fortunately British statesmen know better than to treat such questions with levity or arrogance, and so long as Lord Milner was at the Colonial Office the Dominions knew that they had to deal with one who thoroughly understood and was in sympathy with their faith."

Commenting on these statements, Andrews remarks

'Once let it be known that the Empire stands for an undiluted 'White Australia' policy, and a 'White New Zealand' policy, and a 'White Canada' policy, and, in the long run, there will not be a single Indian, be he moderate or ultra moderate, who will not want to get out of such an Empire altogether.'

I will now give a number of abbreviated extracts from Stokes's long list

'The resources of her (Indian) commerce and the prestige which her possession confers, have set Britain in the foremost place among the nations of the world. No effort no sacrifice has been considered too great to retain the splendid prize' ('Cambridge Modern History')

This reference is to the policy of the United States, of absorbing Anglo Saxons, Celts, Germans, Spaniards, Italians, Slavs, accepting every European variety, but rejecting Mongolian intruders with resolute aversion dwelling in enforced proximity with multitudes of African negroes but refusing to admit them to social or political equality ('Cambridge Modern History')

Meanwhile in the far South East, other semi independent communities have been growing to political maturity

breeds, and assuring to themselves an unparalleled paramountcy of numbers and dominion" (Stoddard)

After reading such statements as these one naturally asks what is to become of the Asiatic peoples Listen to the answer:

"Where, then, should the congested coloured world tend to pour its accumulating human surplus, inexorably condemned to emigrate or starve? The answer is into those emptier regions of the earth under white political control. But many of the relatively empty lands have been set aside by the white man as his own special heritage. The upshot is that the rising flood of colour finds itself walled in by white dykes, debarring it from many a promised land which it would fain deluge with its dusky waves" (Stoddard)

Further.

"Eugenics among individuals is encouraging the propagation of the fit . . . World-eugenics is doing precisely the same thing as to races considered as wholes. Immigration restriction is a species of segregation on a large scale, by which inferior stocks can be prevented from both diluting and supplanting good stocks. Just as we isolate bacterial invasions, and starve out the bacteria by limiting the area and amount of their food supply, so we can compel an inferior race to remain in its native habitat, where its own multiplication in a limited area will, as with all organisms eventually limit its numbers, and, therefore, its influence. On the other hand, the superior races, more self-limiting than others, with the benefits of more space and nourishment, will tend to still higher levels" (S Hall, in the *Journal of Heredity*, March, 1919)

Commenting on this situation, Stokes says

"Now it was in the nature of things that the eastward-tending Mongols should be met by the westward-marching European peoples in the Americas. It was also natural that as the population of South-Eastern Asia grew congested, it should continue its march southward . . . ultimately peopling the Philippines and Australia. But I contend that it is not natural or conducive to the world's welfare for the westward sweeping peoples of Europe to permit small groups of their compatriots wandering far from the path of their race, to obtain possession of those lands which lay in the paths of the other great migrations, and forthwith close them to all but their own people. It was natural that Mongols and Europeans should meet in the Americas for they lay in the race paths of both groups . . . but the Americans are declaring for a 'White America' . . ."

He then summarises the general position as follows

" To put the matter very briefly, the peoples of Europe have utilised the wonderful opportunity afforded them by the mechanical revolution of the last century, with its consequent development of traffic facilities to aggrandise the 'White World' at the expense of the rest of humanity, and now " are naturally anxious to maintain the *status quo* "

" For us the question rather is Can India afford to be permanently associated with a political unit, which, with the United States, stands above all others committed to a policy of racial segregation upon the basis of colour ? "

" The European system has been instrumental in fixing a barrier, which, if maintained, will definitely eliminate any possibility of the ultimate unification of humanity. In future there are to be two species of the genus '*homo*'—one *white*, the other *coloured*. The 'superior race' is to be afforded every opportunity of environment whereby to grow to still greater superiority, the 'coloured' majority of the human race are to be restricted as far as possible to the territories they now occupy "

" It must be evident to the most obtuse that this course will ultimately mean racial deterioration for the peoples thus limited in freedom and opportunity. If these are the prospects of India, is it not a farce to talk of her attaining to the position of an *equal partner* in the comity of nations known as the British Empire ? "

" This has been a sorrowful tale—this story of the breach of a great trust by a great race, endued with many noble qualities and vouchsafed such opportunities for the uplift of mankind as never before fell to any group of peoples. It is the sad record of the betrayal of humanity for its own ends by a race which had inherited the broadening and humane culture of the Greeks ennobled and spiritualised by the teachings of Jesus of Nazareth. The sadness of it lies in the fact that it was in the main an unconscious betrayal. The opportunity was too great for those to whom it came "

Therein we have the chief causes of revolt in India. They open up many absorbing and vital problems, involved in which is the whole question of the comparative value of Western as compared with Eastern civilisation and ideals. Without knowing anything about either Eastern civilisation or Eastern ideals, the greater part of the West assumes, presumably through sheer pride of race, that everything which appertains to itself is superior to that which appertains to other peoples, especially "coloured" races. But can we say

that this assumption is justified? Is it the case that Western civilisation is superior to Eastern? Perhaps it will be worth while to observe what some careful observers think who know both. First, then, let us note what Stokes has to say on the question:

"These races" (German, British and American) "really and honestly believe in their innate superiority, and they consequently think it is both their right and their duty to control the destinies of mankind. I believe that it does not occur to them that they have no right forcibly to exploit the resources of the world, or compel all other nations to adopt their political and economic life to the requirements of Western industrialism. The time may come—God grant it!—when the West, purged by adversity of her pride and predatory industrialism, will look upon the non-white races of the world as equals and brothers, but that time is not yet, and long before it dawns upon us India must have won her own free and independent place in the comunity of races . . ." ("From National Self Realisation")

From the same source comes the following:

"Europe and America have already begun to suffer from the results of the nerve-breaking strain under which their present economic situation forces them to live . . As wealth piles up, luxury is on the increase, and, in America, at any rate, *the ability to spend largely* is fast becoming the ideal of a large section of the community. But this is not all, the people in that country are beginning to reap the fruit of the unnatural intensity of their business life. Each new decade marks the inception of some new branch of research in the field of nervous disorders, nervous breakdowns are becoming more and more common, and insanity is on the increase . . The time is coming when the nations of Europe and America will wake to a realisation of what they have lost, and will, one fears, sigh for it in vain. It may be, however, that, in the time of their need, an enlightened and ennobled India, freed from her present weaknesses and defects, great with the spirit of true simplicity, may be able to preach a gospel of economic and social salvation to those nations which have become weary and broken in striving after that which brings neither contentment to the individual nor prosperity to the State."

Says C. F. Andrews:

"Many of the sanest thinkers in Europe, and many of her most eminent writers, are asking the question openly, in the light of recent events, and in face of all the destruction wrought by the Great War, whether the decline and fall of the new Empire of the West has not already begun."

As this subject is so vitally important, to the West no less than to the East, I think it advisable to give the opinion of several other writers upon it, viz., W. W. Pearson, in "The Dawn of a New Age"

"One of the most remarkable and noticeable facts of recent years is the way in which, in Europe and America where modern civilisation seems to be on the verge of collapse many of the idealists and thinkers who desire to re-shape civilisation on spiritual lines are looking to Asia for inspiration and leadership, having realised the complete bankruptcy of the West to produce such leadership."

Barindra Kumar Ghose, in "The Truth of Life"

"Horde after horde of conquerors have come and gone, and yet India lives. Their swords have sought hard to destroy and have always failed to find and kill her soul. They did not know that to fight India was impossible. In vain does Europe try to replace India's culture with her own, it only helps to call the self involved light to life again. England is trying to teach India her state craft, her industrial conflict, her individualistic, competitive nationalism. India absorbs them all only to quicken the growth of her own garden of life."

Swami Vivekananda

"The whole of the Western world is on a volcano which may burst to-morrow, go to pieces to-morrow. They have searched every corner of the world and have found no respite. They have drunk deep of the cup of pleasure and have found it vanity. Now is the time to work for India's spiritual ideas penetrating deep into the West. Therefore you young men of India I specially ask you to remember this. We must go out we must conquer the world through our spirituality and philosophy. There is no alternative. We must do it or die."

K. S. Ramaswami Sastry, B.A., B.L., in "Hindu Culture"

"The New Age is tired of the fictions and falsehoods of yesterday. The peace of the nineteenth century meant the armed peace of the strong races and the dumb disarmed peace of the weak races. The passions of conquest and exploitation which were freely indulged in by all the European races, burst in a thunderstorm over their own heads in the recent world war. Even now the illusion of strength of arms and armaments has not gone. Very soon this evil will exhibit itself not only in international conflicts but in internal conflicts as well. Hate begets hate, war begets war."

"The pathway of time is strewn with dead Empires. Each new Empire, inflated by hate, thinks itself immortal. But its own evil passions soon lay it low. Humanity is being taught in the school of suffering that the ideal of power must be replaced by the ideal of peace, and the ideal of domination by the ideal of service. Peace will come, not as the result of treaties and alliances and *ententes*, but as an imperious inner-urge born of love."

Lajpat Rai, in "The Call to Young India".

"The democracies of the United States, Great Britain and France are only democracies in name. The men in power, those who possess property, enjoy privileges are as tyrannical towards their own common people as they are towards us."

"You here think that England and America and Japan and France are the freest countries on the face of the globe

. . . Let me tell you . . . they are the most servile people on the face of the globe. Few amongst them can speak the truth. Few amongst them have the spirit of abnegation for higher causes."

"We dread to think of the future of the world in case India and China imbibe the spirit of the West and join hands with Islam in Central and Western Asia. Let the gods beware of arousing the wind lest they may have to reap the whirlwind."

"And I may tell you that world movements foreshadow coming events and unless the British Empire is soon converted into a British Commonwealth it will go to the dogs as other Empires have gone."

"The world has been fighting for material goods. Capital, wealth, labour, markets, where are they leading the world to? Do you hear the cry of Europe?—that Continent is dying . . ."

J R Macdonald, in "The Awakening of India".

"I came away full of presentiments, such as possess one to whom a glimpse of some great coming event has been given. That last day in Calcutta continues to haunt me. It was a peep behind the veil . . . I saw the pageantry of India, its gilded past, its patient peasant toiling till the sun goes down, its newly educated sons, subtle, resentful, proud, cherishing memories and hopes in their hearts. And it seemed to me as though the procession of the old, of India herself, were to last through the ages, whilst our dominion was to pass as the shuttle through the warp, as a lightning flash from cloud to earth. How awe inspiring this land and its people are! How temporary appear our dwelling places in it! Even our best deeds, are they of the stuff

which abides? Our good government—a revolution could bury it in its own dusty ruins Our material gains—a spiritual revival could shrivel them up as the sun parches the grass on the plains Are the pursuits we have taught India, to follow anything but alluring shadows? Is the wealth we are telling her to seek to be anything but dust and ashes? Is the industrial India I saw arising begrimed and strenuous to last and to overshadow the India one sees at the bathing ghats of Benares or feels in the Oriental Library at Bankipur?

Gandhi is very emphatic on the question

The condition of England at present is pitiable I pray to God that India may never be in that plight That which you consider to be the Mother of Parliaments is like a sterile woman and a prostitute Both these are harsh terms but exactly fit the case That Parliament has not yet of its own accord done a single good thing the natural condition of that Parliament is such that without outside pressure it can do nothing

Women who should be the queens of households wander in the street or they slave away in factories For the sake of a pittance half a million women in England alone are labouring under trying circumstances in factories This civilisation is such that one has only to be patient and it will be self destroyed According to the teaching of Mahomed this would be considered a satanic civilisation Hinduism calls it the Black Age I cannot give you an adequate conception of it It is eating into the vitals of the English nation It must be shunned

It is rather refreshing to see ourselves portrayed by means of such simple strokes as Gandhi uses in the following passage

Napoleon is said to have described the English as a nation of shopkeepers It is a fitting description They hold whatever dominions they have for the sake of their commerce Their army and their navy are intended to protect it When the Transvaal offered no such attractions the late Mr Gladstone discovered that it was not right for the English to hold it When it became a paying proposition resistance led to war Mr Chamberlain soon discovered that England enjoyed a suzerainty over the Transvaal It is related that some one asked the late President Kruger whether there was gold in the moon He replied that it was highly unlikely because if there were the English would have annexed it Many problems can be solved by remembering that money is their god We keep the English in India We like their com

merce, they please us by their subtle methods, and get what they want from us To blame them for this is to perpetuate their power We further strengthen their hold by quarrelling amongst ourselves They wish to convert the whole world into a market for their goods "

After exposing the striking evils of Western civilisation, Gandhi proceeds to point out the superiority of the ancient Indian civilisation, maintaining that its builders eschewed the very things upon which the Westerns have concentrated to their bane Thus, speaking of their ancestors, he says

"They further reasoned that large cities were a snare and a useless incubrancce, and that people would not be happy in them that there would be gangs of thieves and robbers, prostitution and vice flourishing in them, and that poor men would be robbed by rich men They were, therefore, satisfied with small villages The ordinary rule was to avoid courts There were no touts to lure the people into them The common people lived independently, and followed their agricultural occupation They enjoyed Home Rule And where this cursed modern civilisation has not reached, India remained as it was before "

Tagore speaks with his usual penetration and sagacity when he declares :

"History has shown that no permanent good can be gained by one set of men at the expense of another Only in a harmonious development is to be found that permanent force of coherence which we call Dharma If now she" (Britain) "tries to keep India weak, her greatness cannot last, but will topple over of itself—the weakness of a disarmed, effete and starving India will be the ruin of the British Empire

"Few have the gift of taking a broad comprehensive view of politics, especially when greed stands in the way

• A permanent connection is against the law of Nature

Even the tree has to yield up its fruit
To make a subjugated country weak, to keep it distracted in disunity, to prevent the natural growth of its powers by refusing to allow their exercise and thus to reduce it to lifelessness—this is England's policy of the day when
pity has ceased to well up for the weak, the unfortunate, the downtrodden; when only the expansion of dominion is accounted greatness; when deeds of daring have given way to aggressive exploitation, and the selfish cult of patriotism has usurped the place of religion" ("Greater India")

In regard to Indian culture, K S Ramaswami Sastry, B A, B L, in his book, "Hindu Culture," states that .

"The Hindu civilisation remains 'not a mere antique, but full of life and youthful vigour' It has seen the birth and the death of many civilisations and is predestined to last for ever'

Further on he says

"The West begins with the body and gropes towards the spirit, India begins with the spirit and visions the place of the outer things in a comprehensive scheme of life To the West the test of values is outside, to India the test of values is inside"

And again .

"On the whole, the outlook is one of courage and hope
Hindu culture is neither moribund nor exhausted

Tagore's poetry and the new art movement in Bengal, the Sri Ramakrishna movement the religious movements in Southern India, the general dawn of a new and radiant national self-consciousness, and the pervasive feeling of re attained power, are the best proofs of the inherent vitality of Hindu culture and of the great truth that we are in the midst of a great Hindu renaissance '

As to the past, Mr Sastry quotes Abbé Dubois

"India is the world's cradle, thence it is that that common mother, in sending forth her children even to the utmost West, has bequeathed to us the legacy of her language her laws, her morals, her literature and her religion Manu inspired Egyptian, Hebrew, Greek and Roman legislation and his spirit permeates the whole economy of our European laws "

Lajpat Rai, again, in "The Call to Young India," makes an interesting statement regarding the function of India in the general development of humanity

"To an Indian the problem of India is national, to humanity it is international India is such a large slice of earth, and contains such a large population, that no person interested in the progress of humanity at large and in true internationalism, can ignore its importance Add to this the fact that it is the pivot of the Orient As the home of Hinduism, the birthplace of Buddhism, and of the most living centre of Islamic activities it occupies a unique place in Asia It is the heart of Asia—the key to the Indian Ocean, and the clearing house of most Asiatic trade It is

also the centre of Asiatic culture China and Japan how to it in reverence, and Central Asia and Western Islamic countries look to it for support and sympathy While its human potentialities are great very great indeed its natural resources defy the imagination Its 'wealth' has been its curse Militarism and imperialism have always looked at it with eyes of greed Half of the world wars have been fought directly or indirectly for it It will continue to be the cause of future wars if its problem is not solved in such a way as to place it beyond the reach of military, adventurous imperialistic intrigues and industrial exploiters It has a manly, brave, industrious intelligent, keenly sensitive and on the whole cultured and peaceably inclined population At no time in their history have the people of India been the exploiters of foreign nations If left to themselves they can provide enough for themselves with plenty of time for the cultivation of art and literature They can help humanity not only with material goods but even with intellectual and spiritual truths Self dependent free from external intrigues relying upon their manhood for their defence, and upon their womanhood for the development of the finer part of human nature, they can be a bulwark to civilisation and a bond of union between the East and the West In blood and race they can claim kinship with both Europeans and Asiatics, in culture with Greece and Rome and Bagdad, in religion with the whole world By genius and tradition they deal in universal terms and values They have never set up any barriers of religion colour or creed to their hospitality, sympathy and good will Even the most caste ridden Hindu is a universalist, admitting that the soul in the meanest of mankind is the same as his "

In regard to the question of the West *versus* the East, the same writer makes the following comment

"If we had learnt the art of telling lies on a broad scale, if we had swept away all our past and entered into the great arena of violence if we had done all these things which at the present moment represent power in the world we might have been considered by the great nations of the world as worthy of self government

I cannot conclude this section of our inquiry without making some reference to the nature of the occupation we maintain in India, especially as regards the personnel of our band of rulers in that country, their general outlook, their attitude towards the Indians, their preconceptions prejudices, etc I will select three quotations,

one from Hyndman one from J R Macdonald and one from Tagore's *Greater India* Says Hyndman

India with its three hundred million inhabitants has for sixty years been under the management of the most extraordinary and fortuitous system of foreign domination known to the memory of man. The rulers of these people come in succession from without educated until their appointment at the age of more than twenty one in accordance with methods as remote from and as irreconcilable with Asiatic ideas as it is possible for them to be. Alike in their work and in their pleasure they keep as far aloof as possible from the people they govern. Very rarely do they marry Indians still more rarely do they settle permanently in the country. I quote an English writer who knew India well. Not only is there no white race in India not only is there no white colony but there is no white man who proposes to remain. No white man takes root in India and the number even of sojourners is among these masses unperceptible.

J R Macdonald testifies

I have met men in India who had been there for a score of years. They knew few Indians they had rarely discussed Indian affairs with them they could not answer accurately some of the most elementary questions about Indian life their opinion on current affairs were obviously the parrot repetitions of club talk or newspaper statements. In fact they were as separate from India as I am at home in London and took their opinions of India in an even more second hand way than I had taken mine before I set foot in Bombay.

Tagore's description is a perfect picture

The Englishman is determined to maintain his hold upon India at any cost so that whenever he finds anything working loose he is bound to hammer in a nail or two promptly and vigorously in order to fix it firmly again. One thing we should always remember—how very small we figure in the Englishman's eyes. He rules us from a remote corner of his vast political arena. All his attention and skill are absorbed in steering through the troubled waters of Europe and of his Colonies. We who inhabit a fringe of his unwieldy Empire—our likes and dislikes our effusions and tantrums alike leave him cold. Hence the soporific power of Indian debates in Parliament. The Englishman passes through this country like flowing water he carries no memory of value away with him his heart strikes no root in its soil. He works with the prospect of furlough

in his mind, and even for his amusements he looks to his compatriots alone. His acquaintance with our language is confined to the depositions of witnesses, and with our literature to translations in the *Government Gazette*. How little of his view we subtend we are apt to forget, and so are every now and again taken by surprise at his callousness towards us. When we blurt out our feelings, he, in turn, naturally considers such expression an exaggeration, which sometimes provokes irritation and sometimes only a smile. I am not saying all this by way of formulating a charge against the Englishman, but merely to point to the facts as they are, and naturally must be. How can the high and mighty have a vision keen enough to discern in detail the agonies, however heart rending the losses, however vital, of what is so very small? So what seems to us of immense moment is negligible to his perceptions. When we rage and fume over the partition of this little province of ours, or of some problem concerning this petty municipality of ours, we are astounded at not getting results in proportion to our outcry. We forget that the Englishman is not of us, but over us, and if ever we should reach the Olympian heights where he dwells, only then could we know at what a distance we are, and how ridiculously diminutive we look. It is because we appeared so small to him that Lord Curzon asked with naïve surprise why we were so absurdly unable to appreciate the glory of being merged in the British Empire. Just think of it!"

THE NEW IDEALISM

Now the outstanding fact in connection with the present awakening in India is, that it is much more than a revolt. Behind the revolt is a new and powerful idealism, which, already, like a mighty purifying stream, is beginning to descend from the heights whence it sprang, and to permeate the valleys, to refresh, enliven and fill with a new hope the teeming masses of that vast country. Were the new movement in India nothing but a revolt against British rule, or an attempt to oust the British capitalist in order to replace him by the Indian capitalist, there would be little—though something—to be said for it, but it has started trends of thought, some new, some old, and has rekindled ancient fires, as well as lit many new ones, which together are the promise not only of a new India, but of a new world. For may it not be that an awakened India, assisted by an ancient culture and a glorious past, and unfettered

by big financial interests, by an industrial system which claims as its victims and deprives of true liberty three-fourths of the people, by a financial system which makes social reform well nigh impossible, destroys free thought, poisons the wells of truth and thus blocks the path to progress by its hold upon the Press, by a militarist and imperialist system which operates amongst all the commercial nations alike, whereby hatred and enmity are artificially kept alive, intercourse is prohibited, a ban is placed on fraternity and culture, and whereby the free flow of all the noble and benign forces which make for the golden age of human brotherhood is prevented, may it not be, I ask, that a country unfettered by such things will ultimately have to save the world from the materialism and the greed that to-day are fast destroying it?

As I have suggested, the present awakening of India is chiefly due to British oppression. There is a limit to the depth of abasement into which even the most decadent people can be thrust. And there can be no question about the fact that India, at the time of the British invasion of that country, was in a state of decadence. Every Indian will acknowledge this. Their once venerable civilisation had fallen into decay, and, as is usual in periods of decadence, India developed a rich class and a large, hopelessly poverty stricken class. Finally, these classes became fixed by means of a caste system which had its sanction in a perverted religion. There was even created such a festering social sore as a moderately large class of "untouchables". Obviously, in such conditions, no sort of progress was possible. A slave mentality existed over a pretty wide area of population, which made it easy for the British or any one else to exercise oppression.

As a fact, the British took advantage of the opportunities offered them, and prospered at India's expense. And yet they did little more, at any rate for a time, than accept India at her own valuation. As Hyndman points out, it was later, much later, in the days of full, legalised control that British tyranny began to be exercised with systematic precision and relentless determination.

All these facts are fully and freely admitted by the sanest minds in India to-day, and not least by the

is a phenomenon almost unique in the history of mankind. There is China and Chinese civilisation owed its greatest religious debt to India.

Mexico Peru Babylonia Egypt all have perished. European civilisation has not yet got through its own youthful centuries of growth and yet it is already showing signs of decay. But India is still bringing forth fruit in her old age. What is the secret?

I find it in one thing namely the deep religious spirit which penetrated from the first the domestic life and made it pure and healthy. The idea of religious duty has become a second nature in the East. The most unscientific test of all in the light of history is this mere material test of power. When great civilisations are judged not by centuries but by millenniums then the test of material power utterly breaks down.

I quote Hyndman

Yet many hundreds of years before the nations of India had been a collection of wealthy and highly civilised people possessed of a great language with an elaborate code of laws and social regulations with exquisite artistic taste in architecture and decoration producing beautiful manufactures of all kinds and endowed with religious ideas and philosophic and scientific conceptions which have greatly influenced the development of the most progressive races of the West.

Gandhi declares

I believe that the civilisation India has evolved is not to be beaten in the world. Nothing can equal the seed sown by our ancestors. Rome went. Greece shared the same fate. The might of the Pharaohs was broken. Japan has become Westernised. Of China nothing can be said but India is still somehow or another sound at the foundation. The people of Europe learn their lessons from the writings of the men of Greece and Rome which exist no longer in their former glory. Such is their pitiable condition. In the midst of all this India remains immovable and that is her glory. Our ancestors set a limit to our indulgence. They saw that happiness was largely a mental condition. Our ancestors dissuaded us from pleasures and luxuries. We had no system of life-corroding competition. Each followed his own occupation or trade and charged a regulation wage. It was not that we did not know how to invent machinery but our forefathers knew that if we set our hearts after such things we would become slaves and lose our moral fibre.

Tagore affirms that ancient India never was imperialistic, thus :

" India never sallied forth for domination, nor scrambled for spoils. China, Japan and Tibet, who are so careful to bar their windows against the advances of Europe, welcomed India with open arms as their *guru*, for she had never sent out armies for plunder and pillage, but only her messages of peace and goodwill. This glory, which India had learned as the fruit of her self-discipline, was greater than that of the widest of Empires "

But India fell into a state of decay. S. E. Stokes states this fact as follows :

" Whatever may be the truth in regard to that " (India's past greatness) " there can be no doubt that, for many hundreds of years, the ancient ideal has been so obscured and corrupted that it has ceased to mould the life of the nation, and inspire her sons to press on in the path of progress or devote their thoughts and efforts to the national well-being. As a consequence, India to-day, after thousands of years of glorious history, finds that she must pause, and attempt to discover, in the light of the present, as well as of the past, the ideal which shall from henceforth shape her destinies. Her sons are called to ' see visions and dream dreams,' and to ask each other, and their own hearts, what they wish the India of the future to be. On all sides the nation is awakening from its age long sleep, and progress is inevitable . . .

" All are intensely conscious of her present fallen state, and feel deeply and bitterly the stigma which the illiteracy, social degradation, and general inefficiency of so many of her sons have cast upon her. Their pride of race has been deeply wounded, and they long to win back for India her lost prestige "

C. F. Andrews dwells on the menace of the " untouchables," and concludes :

" I wish to say, with deep conviction, that independence can never be won if the fifty million of the untouchables—the depressed classes of India—remain still in a state of subjection which amounts almost to servitude . . . "

He further declares that this is the second great problem India must tackle, the first being that of accomplishing Hindu-Muslim unity.

" Only through its solution," he affirms, " lies the direct path to Indian freedom . . ."

And then he concludes—

"I have found out one key fact of Indian history. I have discovered why India forfeited her freedom. India lost her freedom because of the oppression of those humbler and poorer members of society, whose duty it had been to offer service to the community. Instead of being honoured because of their humble work of service they became despised. They were down trodden by the wealthy and the higher castes till in many instances they almost lost the form and dignity of men. That is why India forfeited her freedom."

In the following passage Tagore deals with the cause of this decline

"The long and thorough disorganisation which characterised the Buddhist Age left behind it a shrinking timidity in the succeeding Hindu Samaj—an utter dread of novelty or change—which still persists. Any Samaj which concentrates all its attention on sheer self preservation, cannot freely move or act and comes to a state of death in life.

"The barriers within which the Hindu Samaj then entrenched itself with all it could gather together, caused India to lose her place in the world. Once India was the world's *guru* for her free thought ranged fearlessly over religion, philosophy and science, far and wide. But from that high seat she is now deposed—and that because fear has entered into her soul.

"Our timidity has caused us to stop all voyaging on the high seas—whether of water or of wisdom. We belonged to the universe, but have relegated ourselves to the parish."

Consciousness of one's indisposition and a clear knowledge of the causes of the disease from which one is suffering, are half the battle towards recovery. Now it is Britain, chiefly, that has been the means of effecting the awakening of India. But unfortunately it cannot be said that Britain went to India for that particular purpose. Britain went to India, as Gandhi says, for commerce. She extracted wealth, she oppressed, she oppressed the poor even more than the rich Indians had done. But she instituted forms of oppression to which the Indians were not accustomed, and against which they eventually rebelled. Rebellion led to thought and reflection, and at last India awoke, realised her condition, where and what she was, that she had been asleep, and that the cause of the oppression of the British was

at root her own moral degradation. She tried to shake off her sleep, growled, complained, then stretched herself—and finally attempted to rise. At present she is still struggling to regain her feet, but already her sons are scanning the horizon, looking into the future and shaping in thought the life they would establish in their beloved country, the type of nation they would have their Motherland be. As Tagore and others put it it is up to Indians to "make good" in the situation wherein they now find themselves, and to reward the British for the awakening they have occasioned—notwithstanding that it has been brought about by kicks rather than by caresses—by creating a civilisation that shall be a light unto all the world, and to which even the British will pay homage. Tagore's frankness on this question is invigorating.

"When, with the loss of our glory, we with our bundled up belongings were huddled together in our corner, it was high time for the Britisher to come. At his onslaught the defensive barriers of our crouching runaway Samaj began to give way in places, and through the gaps the Outside in dread of which we had shrunk into ourselves, came hurtling in upon us. Now who shall thrust it back? With this breaking down of our enclosure we discovered two things—how wonderfully strong we had been how miserably weak we had become."

As to the future, he says

The true way of self defence is to use our inherent power. The policy of protection by imitation of the conqueror is a self delusion which will not serve. The only way to stem the tide of waste of heart and waste of intellect is to become our true selves, consciously, actively and with all our strength.

We had once learnt to despise riches to make poverty beautiful and glorious. Shall we to day insult our Sanatan Dharma by falling prostrate before money? Shall we not once more be fit to serve our mother to build anew her fallen house, by taking up a clean disciplined simple life? It was never reckoned a shame in our country to eat off plantain leaves—the shame was in eating by oneself alone. Will that which was once so easy for us become impossible for us to day? Never!

Below are the statements of three more writers upon this question. The first is by Mr Sastry

"We have been enabled by England to preserve our ancient culture and to assimilate modern culture in a harmonious and thoroughly efficient manner."

The second is by J R Macdonald, who, while acknowledging "the other side of the account," yet says:

"The historical fact remains that England saved India. Long before the East India Company built a factory, the old India was vanishing, rent asunder by internal strife, crushed down by foreign armies. We found, not a Government, but shifting camps, not rulers, but captains of horse. Conquerors were rising and falling like cornstalks when the wind blows over the fields, and there was apparently no end to these ups and downs. The Moslem had broken Hindu authority, it, in turn, had been shattered, the Mahratta ascendancy never had a foundation. We came, and consolidation followed on our footsteps. If we cannot say that our rule has been a necessary factor in the development of Indian civilisation, we can say that, in view of historical Indian conditions, it has been a necessary evil. A foreign conqueror had to come, and no nation in the world, either at that time or to day, could have done the work nearly so well as we have done it."

The third is by Barindra Kumar Ghose

"Then came the English with a new touch of light. They were sent because the thought life of India was blurred and burning dim. They came with their touch of rationalism and daring to re-kindle unwittingly the gradually involving light into a blue lambent evolution—a new age soul."

"It was time for Asia—the mother of thought—to arise in a synthetic resurrection—to know herself and to live again for humanity. England—the instrument in the hand of God—must understand that India can never be conquered, rather it is She who is the Eternal Conqueror."

"But at last the impact with the West woke her from her slumber. She saw the material life and glory of these vital races and slowly remembered her past. That memory is not yet complete and so young hearts are still only groping for a fruitful ideal which will express itself in terms of national life a creative thought which will help to rejuvenate the limbs of the nation and build up a manly and self-reliant life structure."

The great task that lies before India, therefore, embraces two main lines of action. She must repair the damage, both material and spiritual, wrought by more than a thousand years of decay, and she must do this

in order that she may conceive aright and build aright the life and the social order she would realise. Happily she is attempting both, and, considering all the circumstances, her progress is phenomenal. Indeed, as I have already said, it is doubtful if a spiritual movement comparable to that which is manifesting itself in India at present has been witnessed in the earth since Jesus Christ attacked the principles which lay at the foundation of the Roman Empire. Thus, whilst the Indian idealists—Gandhi, Tagore, and many others—are laying down the principles of the new world, or the Kingdom of Heaven, they are also trying to remove the flagrant evils which each and all recognise stand in the way of progress. On Gandhi's constructive programme, therefore, we find that the removal of "untouchability" and the accomplishment of Hindu-Muslim unity figure most prominently. That progress is being made with respect to Hindu-Muslim unity will be seen from the following extracts.

Here is an excerpt from a recent letter by Gandhi to Hakim Ajmal Khan, a leading Mussulman :

"I write this to you in your capacity as chairman of the Working Committee, and, therefore, leader of both Hindus and Mussulmans, or, better still, of all India.

"I write to you also as one of the foremost leaders of Mussulmans, but, above all, I write this to you as an esteemed friend. I have had the privilege of knowing you since 1915. Our daily growing association has enabled me to prize your friendship as a treasure. A staunch Mussulman, you have shown in your life what Hindu-Muslim unity means. . . .

"Hindu-Muslim unity must be our creed to last for all time and under all circumstances.

"Nor must that unity be a menace to the minorities—the Parsees, the Christians, the Jews, or the powerful Sikhs. If we seek to crush any of them we shall some day want to fight each other. . . .

"I have been drawn so close to you chiefly because I know that you believe in Hindu-Muslim unity in the full sense of the term. This unity, in my opinion, is unattainable without our adopting non-violence as our firm policy. . . . Hence am I anxious and impatient to persuade my countrymen to feel non-violent, not out of our weakness but out of our strength. But you and I know that we have not yet evolved the non-violence of the strong. And we have not done so because the Hindu-Muslim unity has not

gone much beyond the stage of policy. There is still too much distrust and consequent fear. I am not disappointed. The progress we have made in that direction is, indeed, phenomenal. We seem to have covered in eighteen months' time the work of a generation. Given a sufficient number of Hindus and Mussulmans, with almost a fanatical faith in everlasting friendship between the Hindus and Mussulmans of India, we shall not be long before the unity permeates the masses." (From *Young India* March 16th, 1922)

Replying, Hakim Ajmal Khan says—

"I have no doubt that the secret of the progress of our country lies in the unity of the Hindus, the Mussulmans and other races of India. Such a unity should not be based on policy, for that, in my opinion, will only be a kind of armistice which might with difficulty, be sufficient for present requirements. But I clearly see that the two great communities are coming closer to each other every day. And, although the number of men whose hearts are absolutely free from any sectarian prejudices may not be very great in the two communities, I feel convinced the country has found the road to real unity and will advance on it with steady steps towards its goal."

"But there can be no doubt that we have accomplished the work of generations in months and have actually achieved what the pessimists amongst us considered impossible of achievement." (From *Young India* March 23rd, 1922)

In 1905 Tagore wrote

"There is the Hindu-Muslim friction which it must be the duty of our Swadeshi Samaj to eradicate by equity of treatment and regulation of communal interests."

Bernard Houghton testifies that

"By their determined opposition to the demands of the people for a share in the government of the land they have aroused in Indians and Burmans a spirit of patriotism a will for self sacrifice, a zeal for the greatness of their country, which has transformed and exalted their whole lives. They have killed the old feeling of dull acquiescence in the orders of authority, whether good or bad. More, they have quenched ancient religious and racial feuds, and knit together all men however divergent in race and religion, in common love for their native land. We have seen a Hindu saint preach in a Muhammadan mosque, we have seen the Hindus sympathise with Muhammadans in their anxiety for the Khilafat, and Muhammadans recommend abstention from the sacrifice of cattle."

More than a dozen years ago J R Macdonald wrote
 "Mohammedan and Hindu are no longer like our church
 and chapel but are wolf and lamb lying down together"
 And when these differences have disappeared in British
 India the union which will follow will be closer than if there
 had been no initial soreness. The Mohammedans will have
 experienced the uselessness of privileges for which their
 hearts might have hankered for long. the Hindu is always
 willing to stand on the Nationalist platform with the
 Mohammedan and will forget quite readily his present
 soreness. If it be true that the difficulty has been deli-
 berately created by a few scheming Anglo-Indians they
 have sadly miscalculated the effect of their projects'

As to the point raised by Mr Macdonald in the last
 sentence in the above quotation, Mr Lajpat Rai is very
 emphatic

The bureaucrat may now want to play the Hindus
 against the Muslims. In fact they are already at the game.
 It was the spectacle of Hindu Muslim unity at Amritsar
 that finally exasperated Sir Michael O Dwyer and drove
 him mad. The Hindu Muslim unity was declared to be a anti
 British. The Hindu Muslim unity betokens the dawn
 of a new day in the history of India. The prospect of
 Hindu Muslim unity has already brightened the horizon
 and outlook of many an Indian who had taken to despair.

Concerning religious relations among the workers,
 Mr W P Wadia states in "Labour in Madras" that

As far as the Labour Unions are concerned I may safely
 assert that Hindus of all castes and members of other com-
 munities Muslims Indian Christians etc can and do work
 harmoniously together for their common welfare without
 the least difficulty.

As to the ideal Indians ought to strive after, all the leaders seem to be agreed that it should be one which combines material simplicity with a noble culture and a beautiful fellowship stretching from end to end and from top to bottom of society. And certainly, as Bernard Houghton says

India once free may electrify the world and sway the civilisations of mankind. Three hundred million human beings hitherto hound repressed down trodden will then swing bravely into the van of advancing humanity. Is not that worth while? Is not that worth a hundredfold all the suffering and the strife? In truth we labour at a world event and we shape a Titan's form. Officials and Moderates may prate of training and co-operation. We answer with a world unchained.

We have already seen that both Gandhi and Tagore emphasise the necessity for rehabilitating village life in India on the basis of simplicity and as Tagore specially stresses co-operation. It is interesting to note what S E Stokes says in this connection:

If India is to become great it will be by quiet internal development and by reforming building up and perfecting that form of civilisation which already exists. Let her cling to the ancient traditions of family and village life at the same time ever seeking to purge them of the weaknesses and evils that mar their beauty. Let her look upon the simplicity and frugality of Indian home life as a treasure which she cannot afford to lose and understand that simple living is in no way inconsistent with the very highest education and culture.

Let them (Indians) then while the wind blows so strongly from the west look across the future to an India transformed yet free from the intense and wearing strain of Western activity where in an atmosphere of quiet prosperity the arts of simplicity and learning are cultivated side by side where the careful husbanding and development of the natural resources of the land have made it possible for the poorest to have sufficient for his needs and where education has become the prized possession of all.

Let India therefore cling to the precious heritage of simple living which the West has been so unfortunate as to lose.

In another place he says

One thing at least appears clear to me. No culture is worth striving for which is grounded in self-hatred. No

Nationalism is worth straining for that does not stretch beyond the interest of one's race so as to include the interests of all humanity. Let us pour out our all for India to make her strong and free, but let us do it for humanity. Let our inspiration be—"All we possess for India, and India for mankind." If we can keep this thought in our hearts, and banishing selfish passion, rise to the realisation of the underlying unity of all life, it may be India's high destiny to show to the torn and distracted peoples of our world the path to a truer and a nobler culture—a culture that will unify mankind."

Thus Stokes strongly deprecates India entering into commercial competition with the West. Climatically and temperamentally, he contends she is not fitted for such an enterprise, notwithstanding that he believes that Indians are fully equal in natural capacity to their brethren of the West:

"The vast machine of manufacture commerce and finance, which at present seeks to control and utilise the resources of the world, is," he affirms, "in its organisation, ideals and aims purely a product of the Western economic development. It is as little suited to the needs of this land as the heating apparatus of a London house would be to an Indian bungalow."

Thus to him

"The glory of the India of the future will not lie in commercial or industrial relations with the rest of the world."

and will remain, but racialism must go . . . Regenerated India can and will regenerate the world For this she has to increase and intensify her simplicity of life and her spirituality of outlook. She has to remain a great agricultural country and limit her manufacturing enterprises to her own needs If she complicates her life and increases her wants, she will fall back beaten in the remorseless arena of conflict and can help neither herself nor the world She must have as her allies, peace and intensive agriculture, and not war and intensive industry." ("Hindu Culture")

In the same work Mr Sastry insists that

" Hindu culture must now enter on its active and dynamic stage, and produce new creations of social love and art and religion to make us feel equal to the new age in every respect. . . . It is the function of culture to lift life to noble uses. . . ."

" The last great world-war has gone the way of previous wars and left only pride and bitterness behind The victories of the victors and the humiliations of the vanquished have equally impoverished the spirit of man Thrones and dominations are crashing amongst the conflicts of revolutions . . . Here is India's opportunity and duty and privilege Here is the predestined work for the Hindu race It is for this that India has been dowered with a life eternal which intellectual Greece and unperal Rome did not possess "

W. W Pearson expresses his impression thus

" But this question of the political position of India in the future is of minor importance compared with the position of moral leadership which she seems destined to attain " ("The Dawn of a New Age")

In the same book the author quotes the following words of Aurobindo Ghose'

" Our aim will therefore be to help in building up India for the sake of humanity —this is the spirit of the Nationalism which we profess to follow We say to humanity: ' The time has come when you must take the great step and rise out of a material existence into the higher, deeper and wider life towards which humanity moves . . . '

C. F. Andrews speaks as an educationist

" The more I have thought over this historical problem of Asia, the cradle of all the earliest civilisations and the birthplace of all the noble religions, the more convincingly the conclusion has come home to me that it is because her peoples, as a whole, are fundamentally religious that they have survived while others have perished . . .

" If however, the time should come when the peoples of Asia, hypnotised by the maternal power of the West, should abandon their God given function of creative life in religion, then I cannot tell how great would be the fall, not only for Asia itself but for the whole world "

" I have profound faith, based on experience, that India in our present generation has a spiritual message of supreme value to give to mankind "

' But there is a materialism to day which has infected the very air we breathe '

" Asia has always had faith in spiritual ideals. She has always placed the true value of life in things divine, not in material possessions. It is because I have found this faith in the higher life so vitally present in her that India has truly become my second home, dearer to me than Europe, with all her material splendour. It is because of this faith in spiritual ideals, that Indians have become to me the truest friends I have ever had or could ever wish to have dearer than brothers to me, dearer than life itself "

A little later he says -

" The true education of ancient India was not given amid the paraphernalia of great ugly buildings and cumbersome furniture, costing fabulous sums of money, but in the natural school rooms of the forest Ashrams, underneath the shady trees and in thatched mud cottages - the ideal of the Brahmachari Ashram the ideal of the forest hermitage, is not a dead ideal of the past. It is the very secret of India's true national greatness in education. It is the secret which must be learned afresh in the days of freedom which are now dawning "

We must revive this ideal of simplicity which has been snatched away from us. The West has brought in its place a vulgar ideal—the ideal of bigness the ideal of power

Believe me—I speak as a convert in this, who has been converted from this false religion of material Europe, this worship of bigness and power. Believe me, Europe herself, and America also will each in turn, have to bow their heads and become humble as little children if they desire to enter into the Kingdom of Heaven of Learning in all its beauty and truth

" The Brahmachari Ashram, in its ideal of poverty and renunciation, must be restored if our learning to-day in India is to be worthy of the source from whence it sprang "

It might be added that Mr Andrews is connected with a school at Shantiniketan which is conducted on the lines he suggests. In his little book, "To the Students," he describes, as I have previously mentioned, a day

with the boys at this school. It is so beautiful that I am tempted to quote it. Here it is:

" If I were to describe to you one day in the Ashram with the boys that would, perhaps, bring home to you its inner beauty. Long before sunrise, like the birds in our own Amloki groves, our boys are awake. The choristers are the first to rise, and they go round the Ashram singing their morning hymn. You can hear the voices in the distance, drawing nearer and nearer, and then the sound dies away, as the choir passes on to another part of the Ashram, and then, again, it comes nearer and nearer. The beauty of the sound in the silent morning air, and the sense of joy and reverence which it brings, give peace to the soul.

" After an interval, each boy takes his *asan*—his square of carpet—into the fields and sits down on it to meditate in his own place alone. Later on, before the school work begins, the boys all stand together in the shade of the trees and sing their hymn to God.

" Till about half past ten the work of the school goes on. We have no class rooms. The boys sit with their teachers, in the open air, under the trees. There are no large classes. A group of eight or ten boys will be seated round the teacher, asking him questions. Very few books are used. Like the education which Plato loved at Athens the greater part is carried on through conversation. The boys soon learn to open out all their difficulties to their teachers and the teachers get keenly interested in the boys' questions and answers. . . Such living education can never be dull.

" When the morning work is over, the boys bathe and go to their meal. About two o'clock in the afternoon the school classes begin again, but at this time the work is chiefly with the hand as well as with the mind. Handiwork is practised, and a boy's own natural tastes are soon discovered. Some prefer carpentering, others prefer mechanical work, others enjoy spinning and weaving, others become skilled craftsmen or painters, others musicians. There is very little book work in the afternoon.

" School is over at about four o'clock, and then there is a rush to get first into the great open fields for football. Our Shantiniketan boys are famous everywhere for their sports and games.

" In the evening, at sunset they return from the fields and sit down once more, for a short time, to meditate in silence. As night comes on fairy stories are told; short dramas are recited, our Gurudeva's songs are sung, and the different school gatherings are held.

" By nine o'clock all are glad to retire to rest, and again the choristers go round the Ashram singing their last evening hymn. There can be no question as to the happy-

ness of the life of our boys. Their faces tell the story of their joy and freedom. There is no freer life in India than the life of our children at Shantiniketan."

Tagore is very critical of the tendency to concentrate on political activity, and especially of the tendency to strengthen the central government. He, too, would go back to the days of social simplicity, but, unlike Gandhi, he is for taking advantage of labour saving mechanical appliances. His appeal is particularly to the young idealists, whom he warns against the temptations to external power which are now spoiling so many of India's sons, reminding them that

"In the old days those who were decorated by the imperial power of the Moghuls, and called to share its counsels, did not find their fullest satisfaction in these honours. They gave a higher place to the approval of their own Samaj. And for the highest reward, which even Delhi had not in its gift, they had to come and stand at the cottage door of the village of their birth. Acknowledgment as a high souled member of the community by the meanest there meant more than the highest Maharajaship conferred by the Sarkar. In those days they had learnt to value appreciation by the Motherland in the very depths of their being, and the pomp of the metropolis never succeeded in drawing their hearts away therefrom."

He calls the young men to go forth and re-create India by reorganising their villages on a co-operative basis. Let me quote his words.

'Our Provisional Conference would scatter branch organisations throughout the country, whose first and foremost duty would be the collection of every possible information, for precise knowledge must precede all efficient work.'

"Then again, for the organisation to be strong the component units must be developed and each village must therefore be made self dependent. They must have their schools, their workshops, their grain golas, their co-operative stores and banks and they must be assisted and encouraged to found them and taught to maintain them."

"The time has come when co-operative methods must step in and prevent the results of our labour from sliding down that inclined plane which leads into the foreigner's granary. Modern labour-saving appliances must be freely utilised, and this cannot be done without combination. Improved power looms, more efficient sugar-cane crushing machines, appliances for utilising jute, the manufacture

of dairy products on a large scale Such co-operative centres will, however, be attended by none of the well-known evils which follow in the wake of large-scale town factories "

Continuing, he appeals to the young men as follows :

" Take, each of you, charge of some village and organise it Educate the villagers and show them how to put forward their united strength, so that they may in co-operation better their wretched lot Look not for fame or praise in this undertaking Do not expect even the gratitude of those for whom you would give your life but be prepared rather for their opposition

" If our Provisional Conferences can help to spread sheltering and fruitful branches over each village, then will our country be really ours, and with the flow of life in the veins, the functions of the Congress as the heart-centre will become real, and India will enthrone it in her breast '

It will have been observed that all the writers whom I have quoted have their minds on world-wide reconciliation and the ultimate realisation of unity amongst all mankind on the basis of a common culture and a common civilisation ; or, at any rate, they believe that given freedom, full scope for development, opportunity for fellowship and culture, the East will win for itself a place which will make it a worthy partner with the West in the great work of creating that highest type of humanity which, after all, is the final end of civilisation Tagore, in his own inimitable way, expresses this view thus

' So, in the evolving history of India, the principle at work is not the ultimate glorification of the Hindu, or any other race In India the history of humanity is seeking to elaborate a specific ideal, to give to general perfection a specific form which shall be for the gain of all humanity , nothing less than this is its end and aim And in the creation of this ideal type if Hindu, Moslem or Christian should have to submerge the aggressive part of their individuality, that may hurt their sectarian pride, but will not be accounted a loss by the standard of truth and right "

It may be added by way of parenthesis, that some years previously, Tagore, in briefly describing the chief periods in Indian history, had said :

" And so now all the four great religions of the world are here together—Hinduism, Buddhism, Mohamedanism

and Christianity It is evident that India is God's chemical factory for the making of a supreme religious synthesis

Finally he declares

All the trouble that we see nowadays is caused by this failure of East and West to come together Bound to be near each other and yet unable to be friends is an intolerable situation In spite of all retarding factors our impact with the West must be made good—there can be no escape for India until she has made her own whatever there may be worth the taking from the West If we remove our own poverty we can make him (the Englishman) overcome his miserliness

Only when she (India) can meet him (the English man) as his equal will all reason for antagonism and with it all conflict disappear Then will East and West unite in India—country with country race with race knowledge with knowledge endeavour with endeavour Then will the history of India come to an end merged in the history of the world which will begin

And in a recent article in *Foreign Affairs* Lajpat Rai declared

As Indians we can be a source of strength to Britain as well as to the rest of humanity contributing to the world's stock of knowledge art and science poetry and music co-operating freely voluntarily and whole heartedly in keeping the peace of the world and in carrying aloft the banner of human progress As British slaves we are mere pawns in the game to be used to crush the liberties of other nations or as hewers of wood and drawers of water for the Empire

It needs no words of mine to point out that the present crisis in India is much more than a struggle for political freedom The awakening that has resulted from the revolt against British oppression is creating demands for infinitely more far reaching changes than the abolition of British rule important as that is Whilst there are no doubt many supporters of the National Congress and of its policy of Non co-operation who would be glad to see British rule brought to an end for no other reason than that of establishing the Indian capitalist in the stead of the British capitalist there is a great and growing body of opinion in favour of the abolition of capitalist industry and the complete overthrow of materially founded class distinctions and in favour of the estab-

lishment of an economic democracy, a real co operative commonwealth

Thus India is becoming increasingly antagonistic to the competitive industrial system of the capitalist West Lajpat Rai insists that

All classes of people must feel that salvation will come from within with co operation mutual help and mutual trust and not from without by endless heartless merciless and soulless competition

But he is not thinking of the foreign exploiter only, he is out against the system For example

With the elimination of the foreign exploiter we shall have left the domestic one We do not want to give our time and energy and life for the benefit of the native exploiter be he prince or priest We want to preach the gospel of social democracy (The Call to Young India)

B P Wadia strikes the same note in his Labour in Madras

I am not putting forward a claim on behalf of the Indian merchant The Indian landlord is a capitalist and the Indian merchant is a capitalist also

Labour problems must be regarded as part of the general national problems and the interests of labour must be safeguarded against the inroads by capital both Indian and foreign

To this end certain principles have to be borne in mind The Indian labourer's right to citizenship must be fully recognised Legislation must cease to regard him as a hand in letter and spirit

It is no more a question of increase of wages and decrease of hours it is no more a question of the utility of the weapon of strikes and lock outs It is a new orientation—the abolition of every vestige of slavery of any kind whatever from the body politic of the system as a whole which tarnishes the life of labour

Let us not deceive ourselves with exploded theories of profit sharing and the like

Thus while Mr Sastry says that India must combine the improvement of cottage industries and the communistic basis of industry with the use of machinery and the factory system, and that Indians must not become

mere adjuncts to machinery or lose humanism in mere industrial over productivity." Mr Lajpat Rai contends that India wants

Leaders who will not be afraid to attack and criticise the men of property power and privilege among their countrymen as fearlessly and mercilessly as they do the foreign exploiter who realise and will preach that what they want is real democracy, and not the mere substitution of the rule of their own men of property and privilege for that of the foreign imperialist and capitalist

To attain this end, India is taking a line peculiar to herself. The whole world is watching her every movement, while the great fraternity of all those who believe in and are expectantly looking forward to the creation of a new humanity and a nobler civilisation are yearning for her success. So far, India's way of attaining the goal we all desire to reach is not the way of the West, but who shall say that it is not the right way? We are proceeding badly along ours, until we make much better progress than we can yet boast, let us be patient and hopeful regarding India. We have all much to learn. But whether India is right or we are right, one thing is certain no more wonderful or heroic endeavour to secure freedom—freedom of mind and spirit, full economic freedom—has ever been made by any people than is being made to day by Indians. Surely it is our great privilege as well as our urgent duty to help them all we can, for, after all, their battle is ours and if they win to-day we shall win to-morrow. Who first wins through to economic freedom wins the greatest battle of the ages for the whole of mankind.

To day the leaders of this great movement are being persecuted with almost merciless rigour by a Government which purports to represent the foremost Christian nation of the world.

Speaking of this Government, or whomsoever is responsible for the existing state of things in India, Mr Lajpat Rai said in a speech in Bombay, in 1920

Now our masters tell us that we are wanting in practical intellect! That subtlety which makes two and two appear five. Well I may tell you that is a dangerous game. If they goad us to-day like that who knows what young

India may not do? But at the same time I do not want you to make your intellects so subtle as that "

To say the least, it is not very consoling for a Britisher to read caustic statements like that. But the plain fact to be faced by us is that India wants freedom and we refuse to give it to her. The crime of the Indians is a love of freedom a desire to rule their lives in accordance with their own ideas and ideals. We will not permit it. Patriotism the love of the Motherland and the desire for self determination, accounted the highest virtues in Britain, are regarded as the greatest crimes in India. But not only are we persecuting the Indians for pursuing Christian ends, we are persecuting them for seeking to attain them by Christian means. For preaching non violent Non co-operation all the while pleading for and manifesting complete friendliness towards the British, Gandhi and his co-workers have been cast into prison. Yet the indisputable fact is that Gandhi is the greatest and most Christ like figure in contemporary history. We cannot think of him and of his wonderful achievements and heroic endeavours without thinking of Christ. Nor can others. Everywhere the two names are being brought together. *Young India* commenting on Gandhi's arrest, in its issue of March 16th 1922, says

Mr Gandhi and Mr Banker have been arrested under section 124A of the Indian Penal Code for creating or attempting to create disaffection towards the Government and committed to the Court of Sessions. That is how the Government has at last opened its long contemplated great offensive against the determined and unshakable resolve of India to attain Swaraj and have the Khilafat and the Punjab wrongs redressed. The battle that thus commences will ever remain as the most memorable in the history of mankind for on its issue depends the entire future course of human history. And it will be the proud privilege of this ancient country we hope to have succeeded in eliminating for ever brute force from human relations and replacing it with truth and love. That will truly herald the dawn of the Kingdom of God on earth and bring real freedom both to India and England. We mean to achieve our object because it is just and right. But we want the Englishman to grasp our hand at the end of the struggle as a friend thanking us for having helped him to conquer his baser self.

Referring to the trial of Gandhi, in *Young India*, March 23rd, 1922, T Prakasan remarks:

"Mahatma Gandhi's trial and conviction of March 18th, 1922, in the city of Ahmedabad marks out a new epoch in the history of the world. A parallel to this can be found only in the life of Jesus or in that of Prahlad . . ."

In the leading article of the same issue there are the following remarks:

"The trial, which took place on the 18th inst before the sessions judge of Ahmedabad is the most memorable trial that the world has witnessed since the days of the great Prophet of Palestine. It was not the prisoner at the bar who was on trial. It was the system of government represented by the learned judge . . . and the sentence was really the sentence passed against that system.

More than nineteen centuries ago another Empire tried to deprive God's children of their birthright. The countries Rome sought to subjugate have won back their liberties. That is how God administers justice.

"To day another 'Empire,' built on organised force, maintained by sheer 'hard fibre,' and engaged in the exploitation of the weak and the helpless, questions the right of one-fifth of the entire population of the world to manage its own affairs, refers to the Government created by itself for the administration of the country inhabited by three hundred million human beings possessing the oldest culture in the world as a 'Subordinate Imperial Department,' interferes with the religious liberty of the people, commits the brutal atrocities of the Punjab, shamelessly breaks its plighted word, and when the poor oppressed people try to defend their rights, even though it be by non-violent Non-co-operation, which is essentially an appeal to human conscience, it throws their saintly leader into prison. Can this 'Empire' escape divine punishment?

There are some who have ears but hear not, have eyes but see not. Such do not see the writing on the wall . . ."

Do the British see it like this? What, one wonders, will be the verdict of history? The facts are worthy of the most serious consideration. For seeking to free his countrymen from a burdensome foreign yoke imposed primarily for the sake of material exploitation, and to build up a new social order on a spiritual foundation, eschewing every form of violence, Gandhi has been sentenced by the British authorities in India to six

years' imprisonment for sedition, that is, for seeking to undermine the British Empire. Nearly two thousand years ago Christ, for doing almost exactly the same thing, was condemned to death under the Roman *Ægis*, for what was, in effect, a charge of attempting to undermine the Roman Empire.

~~THE LABOUR INTERNATIONAL
HANDBOOK.~~

By The Labour Research Department.
4448
12-50

12s. 6d.

~~THE FOUNDATIONS OF
IMPERIALIST POLICY.~~

By Michel Pavlovitch.

[*The Worker's Library.*] 3s. 6d.

ECONOMIC IMPERIALISM.

By L. S. Woolf.

2s. 6d.

THE CIVIL WAR IN FRANCE and two
other Manifestoes.

By Karl Marx.

Introduction by R. W. Postgate.
[*Labour Classics No. 1.*] 3s.

A HISTORY OF THE LAST HUNDRED
DAYS OF ENGLISH FREEDOM.

By William Cobbett.

Introduction, "Main Events in Cob-
bett's Life" and a Biographical Index
by J. L. Hammond.

[*Labour Classics No. 2.*] 5s.

THE DEFENCE OF TERRORISM. A
reply to Karl Kautsky's "Terrorism and
Communism."

By L. Trotsky.

Paper 3s 6d.

THE LABOUR PUBLISHING COMPANY, LTD.,
6, Tavistock Square, London.